

What do “Scientists” who Snub the Big Bang Know?

“*Nothing*,” is the **correct answer** in this specific context. Although scientists as a *whole* are often publicly lauded as the “most trusted” societal subgroup; just like the rest of us they too are vulnerable to lapsing into error. Was the scientific method compiled *just* for the fun of it? Of course not! What scientists *actually* “know” after their research is the result of rigorous scientific scrutiny which sharpened over time by anticipating further potential investigative traps. Indeed the more attuned a scientist is to avoid snares, the more likely they are to succeed in their research targets.

Confusion over this matter centers on the distinction between “science” as a **disciplined research method** and **agents** who pursue such endeavors. The former in part specifies the very objects that science has the capacity to study. The latter concerns questions of the integrity of the researcher in terms of competence, intellectual understanding, and commitment to parameters that science itself prescribes. That stricture relevant to addressing my title entails phenomena that includes physical entities and interactions that can be detected by one or more of our five senses. Science *also* acknowledges possible objects such as those too tiny to perceive with either our senses or our most advanced technical instruments for the reason that (for example) specifically force-fields were *initially* the only avenue for surmising the existence of **sub**-atomic particles.

The above examples, however, aren’t the problem that emboldens the “scientists” that trigger my title. Instead it is out of their belief in a multiverse¹ (**m-v**) that they are driven to deny creation - by the Big Bang (**BB**). See the article, “10 Reasons the Multiverse is a Real Possibility,” where every point **falls short** of a **solid** declaration.² The reason behind the hesitations is the **impossibility** of actually witnessing potential other universes. Whatever you have either heard or read about “multiverses” is pure speculation void of substantial factual evidence. This is not to belittle the competence of specialists who construct complex mathematical formulas, etc., but instead to recall that m-v conjectures have **no possibility of being tested** by alleged outer-space speculations that **no** earthly-speculator has access to. *Scientific American* magazine states, “*All parallel universes lie outside our horizon and remain beyond our capacity to see, now or ever, no matter how technology evolves...[so that] none of these claims...can be directly substantiated.*”³ So then, does the MV qualify as *interesting* fantasy? Maybe. But can they **know** it to be so? The answer is emphatically **No; Not ever!**

On the other hand the BB is solidly substantiated.⁴ See also Dr. Hugh Ross’s book, *The Creator and the Cosmos*,⁵ where he states that the resistance to the BB by certain astronomers “is based **not** on what observations and experiments they can test but what observations and experiments can **never** test...[They] engage in **metaphysics** rather than in physics”⁶ (boldface mine).

Gary Jensen, NALC Lutheran Pastor, retired © February 14, 2025

Gjensen549@gmail.com ** Christianityontheoffense.com ** lookanothertime.blogspot.com

M.Div., Luther/Northwestern Theological Seminary ** M.A. with Honors in *Science and Religion*, BIOLA University

¹ There are numerous articles on the internet on this subject.

² <https://science.howstuffworks.com/10-reasons-multiverse-is-real-possibility.htm>

³ <https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/does-the-multiverse-really-exist/> "substantiated."

⁴ See my 1-page paper, The Big Bang is *Scientifically-Substantiated as True* at my website: www.christianityontheoffense.com/articles

⁵ 4th ed. (RTB, 2018), pp. 85-107.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 76.